

REMARKS

Applicants have received and carefully reviewed the Office Action of the Examiner of April 29, 2008 in which claims 8-15 were rejected. Favorable consideration of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-15 have been cancelled and new claims 16-23 have been presented. Support for these claims may be found, for example, in Figure 1 and the corresponding portion of the specification, and in previously presented claims 8-15. No new matter has been introduced.

The now-cancelled claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being variously unpatentable over Cartellieri et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,655,280 in view of Moetteli, U.S. Patent No. 4,773,327, Cartellieri et al. in view of Moetteli and further in view of Blackwell, U.S. Patent No. 5,778,785, and Cartellieri et al. in view of Moetteli further in view of Fischer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,662,043. Applicants respectfully believe that these rejections are inapplicable to the newly presented claims 16-23.

New independent claim 16 incorporates the features of now-cancelled independent claim 9 and dependent claim 10. Dependent claim 10 was rejected over Cartellieri et al. in view of Moetteli and Blackwell. Column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 6 and 32-37 of Blackwell are cited to support the assertion in the Office Action that a ceramic deposit to reinforce the continuous edge of the blade would be an obvious modification of the other cited prior art devices. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Blackwell specifically provides that a hard-material coating (12), preferably a ceramic coating, is applied to the top (2) of the ink fountain blade (1) and "is located on the chamfer 5 and from there extends over part of the length of the individual blades 10." Column 3, lines 62-64. This is illustrated by Figures 3 and 4 of Blackwell.

In other words, Blackwell specifically and only provides that the ceramic coating be formed and deposited directly on top of the individual blades, or sectors, (10), so as to form individual deposits of ceramic coating on each sector.

There is consequently no suggestion in Blackwell to apply the ceramic coating to reinforce anything else than the extremities of the individual blades, or sectors, (10), still less as reinforcement of the continuous edge of the blade lying on top of the sectors as claimed.

It is therefore believed that the specific combination claimed in independent claim 16 of "An ink fountain...comprising a blade...wherein said blade rests along a plane [of the sectors]

directly on a surface of said sectors...and includes a ceramic deposit to reinforce said continuous edge of the blade" is not suggested by or obvious over the cited prior art and is in consequent in condition for allowance. As claims 17-22 depend from claim 16 and contain additional elements, Applicants submit that these claims are likewise in condition for allowance. As independent claim 23 contains elements similar to claim 22, Applicants submit that this claim is likewise in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and further examination of the rejections are respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance in due course is requested. If a telephone conference might be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at.(612) 677-9050.

Respectfully submitted,  
Daniel Baertschi et al.  
By their Attorney,

Date: August 28, 2009

/david m. crompton/  
David M. Crompton, Reg. No. 36,772  
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800  
Minneapolis, MN 55403-2420  
Telephone: (612) 677-9050  
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349